RECEIPT NUMBER

37921



## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

JUDGE : Edmunds, Nancy G.

DECK : S. Division Civil Beck DATE : 07/14/2005 @ 12:07:26

CASE NUMBER: 2:05CV72769
CMP CARL BURGESS V. BASE CORP

(DA) SI

CARL BURGESS

Plaintifff,

-VS-

**BASE CORPORATION** 

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MORGAN

Defendant,

HUIZENGA & HERGT, P.C. By: John P. Hergt P31332 Attorneys for Plaintiff 1415 Penobscot Building Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 963-4200

## COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

NOW COMES, the Plaintiff, Carl Burgess, by and through his attorneys, HUIZENGA & HERGT, P.C., and for his Complaint against the, Defendant, BASF Corporation states as follows:

#### GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff, Carl Burgess, resides in the City of Detroit, and is domiciled in and a citizen
of the State of Michigan.

- Defendant, BASF Corporation, is a corporation organized and existing under the laws
  of the State of Delaware having its principal place of business in the State of New
  Jersey or a State other than Michigan.
- This Court's diversity of citizenship jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. §
   1332(a)(1) as the plaintiff and the defendant in this action are citizens of different states.
- 4. This is a civil action between citizens of different States where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000.00 exclusive of interest, and costs.
- This Court's federal question jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1331
  as Count I of this action arises out of the Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA")
  29 U.S.C.A. § 2601 et seq.
- Defendant is and was at all times materially relevant hereto an "Employer" as that term is defined in Section 2611(4)(Λ) of the FMLA.
- Count II of this action is brought pursuant to the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act ("ELCRA") M.C.L. 37. 2101 et seq.

#### COUNT 1

- 8. For Count One of his Complaint plaintiff incorporates paragraphs one (1) through (7) of his complaint as though fully stated here.
- 9. Plaintiff commenced his employment with the Defendant in on or about December 5, 1977 as a Business Development Manager and was last employed by the defendant at its Livonia, Michigan office as a Technical Service Representative II.
- 10. One April 21, 2003 plaintiff was placed on Medical Leave by the defendant and on April 25, 2003 underwent double by-pass heart surgery which disabled him from his employment.
- 11. On July 21, 2003 plaintiff returned to work from his leave but was not returned to his position but placed in a newly created job, stripped of his accounts, and given insignificant assignments on an ad hoc basis, and his performance was unfairly criticized.
- 12. On November 11, 2003 plaintiff notified the defendant of a violation of the Family Medical Leave Act by contacting the defendant's Corporate Compliance Hot Line and complaining that he had not been placed back in his position or an equivalent position

and that his job performance had been unfairly criticized by his Supervisor, Steven Hicks, following his return from leave.

- 13. On November 20, 2003 plaintiff's supervisor, Steven Hicks, placed the plaintiff on a Performance Improvement Plan for a 90 day period and terminated his employment.
- 14. By reason of the acts herein alleged defendant in violation of his FMLA rights, and failed to reinstate him to his former position or an equivalent position in violation of the Family Medical Leave Act. 29 U.S.C.A. § 2601 et seq.
- 15. By reason of the acts herein alleged defendant retaliated against the plaintiff for exercising his rights under the FMLA and complaining that his rights had been violated as prohibited by the Family Medical Leave Act. 29 U.S.C.A. § 2601 et seq.
- 16. Defendant refused to return the plaintiff to an equivalent position, unfairly down graded his performance and terminated plaintiff's employment with knowledge of the requirements of the FMLA or in reckless indifference to those requirements.
- 17. As a direct and proximate result of the acts herein alleged plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain into the future wage and benefit losses and the loss of his employment.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, Carl Burgess, requests this Court enter judgment in his favor and against the Defendant is such an amount in excess of Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00) as he shall be found entitled to compensated him for his past, present, and future wage and benefits losses together with costs, interest, attorney fees and liquidated damages.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff further requests such other legal and equitable relief as is just and proper including but not limited to reinstatement if feasible.

## **COUNT TWO**

- 18. For Count II of his complaint plaintiff incorporates paragraphs one (1) through seven (7) of the General Allegations and paragraph nine (9) of Count I as though fully stated here.
- 19. Plaintiff performed his duties as Technical Service Representative II in a manner that met his employers business expectations having received a performance evaluation rating his performance in March of 2003 as meeting expectations.
- 20. That following the plaintiff's placement on leave his primary account was given to a younger individual who was less qualified to perform the duties of the position than plaintiff who was born January 27, 1953 and was fifty years of age.

- 21. That following the plaintiff's termination he was replaced by a younger individual the defendant had sought to place in his position.
- 22. Plaintiff's age was a determining factor in the defendant's decision to remove plaintiff from his position and terminate his employment.
- 23. By reason of the acts herein alleged defendant discriminated against the plaintiff because of his age in violation of the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, M.C.L. 37.2101 et seq.
- 24. As a direct and proximate result of the acts herein alleged plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain into the future wage and benefit losses and has suffered emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, Carl Burgess, requests this Court enter judgment in his favor and against the Defendant is such an amount in excess of Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00) as he shall be found entitled to compensated him for his past, present, and future wage and benefits losses, and the emotional distress he has suffered together with costs, interest, attorney fees.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff further requests such other legal and equitable relief as is just and proper including but not limited to reinstatement if feasible.

# HUIZENGA & HERGT P.C.

John P. Hergt (P31332)

Dated: July 13, 2005

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

JUDGE : Edmunds, Nancy G.

DECK : S. Division Civil Deck DATE : 07/14/2005 @ 12:07:26 CASE NUMBER : 2:05CV72769

CMP CARL BURGESS V. BASF CORP (DA) SI

CARL BURGESS

Plaintifff,

-VS-

**BASE CORPORATION** 

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MORGAN

Defendant,

HUIZENGA & HERGT, P.C. By: John P. Hergt P31332 Attorneys for Plaintiff 1415 Penobscot Building Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 963-4200

#### JURY DEMAND

and the second s

Plaintiff, Carl Burgess, through his attorneys Huizenga & Hergt P.C. hereby demands a Trial by Jury of all his causes of action in this case.

HUIZENGA & HERGT P.C.

John P. Hergt (P31332)

Dated: July 13, 2005

P. 3/332

JS 44 11/99

["]

 $\Box$ 

DATE

ÖRIĞIN

Original

7/14/05

120 Marine

# **PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11**

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	
If yes, give	the following information:	
Co u rt:		
Case No.:	<del> </del>	
Judge:		
	•	
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)	
lf yes, give	the following information:	
Court:		
Case No.:	<del></del>	
Judge:		
Notes :		